

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

80 Wis. 284, 50 N. W. Rep. 180; Budge v. L. & T. Ry. Co., 108 La. 349, 32 South. Rep. 535, 58 L. R. A. 333; C. B. & I. Ry. Co. v. Avery, 109 Ill. 314; Youngblood v. Ry. Co., 60 S. C. 9, 38 S. E. Rep. 232, 85 Am. St. Rep. 824; Bender v. Ry. Co., 137 Mo. 240, 37 S. W. Rep. 132; St. Louis & S. E. Ry. Co. v. Valirius, 56 Ind. 511; Union Stockyards v. Goodwin, 57 Neb. 138, 77 N. W. Rep. 357; T. P. Ry. Co. v. Archibald, 170 U. S. 665, 18 Sup. Ct. 777, 42 L. Ed. 1188; Goodrich v. N. Y. C. & H. R. Ry. Co., 116 N. Y. 398. The railroad company must see that the cars are safe or refuse to take them.

Negligence—Selling Poison Without Label—Proximate Cause.—Defendant corporation manufactures and sells creamery supplies. It sold a jug of sulphuric acid to a creamery but failed to label it as required by statute. The jug was placed on a shelf in the creamery where buttermilk was kept in similar jugs for the use of customers and employees. Plaintiff's minor son received permission to get a drink of buttermilk, drank from the jug of sulphuric acid by mistake and died. Held, the jury having properly found that defendant's failure to label the jug was the proximate cause of the injury, the negligence of the manager of the creamery did not relieve defendant. Burk v. Creamery Package M'f'g. Co. (1905), — Ia. —, 102 N. W. Rep. 793.

Violation of the statute requiring poisonous liquors to be labeled is negligence per se. Ives v. Weldon, 114 Ia. 476, 54 L. R. A. 854; Chicago etc. Ry. Co. v. Boggs, 101 Ind. 522; Hourigan v. Nowell, 110 Mass. 470. The particular result need not be such as to be foreseen. Salisbury v. Herschenroder, 106 Mass. 458; Smith v. Packet Co., 86 N. Y. 408; Ehrgott v. Mayor, 96 N. Y. 264. An accident may be attributed to all or any one of several proximate causes contributing to it, if each is an efficient cause without the operation of which the accident would not have happened. Lane v. Atlantic Works, 107 Mass. 104; Slater v. Mercereau, 64 N. Y. 138; Pittsburg etc. Ry. Co. v. Spencer, 98 Ind. 186.

PRINCIPAL AND AGENT—EXTENT OF AUTHORITY—BURDEN OF PROOF.—Plaintiff contracted with defendant's agent for certain irrigation machinery. Defendant repudiated the contract and in defense to an action for damages sets up the fact that the agent had authority to solicit orders but not to make an absolute contract of sale. Held, that the contract was not binding upon the defendant. Baker & Co. v. Kellett-Chatam Machinery Co. (1905), — Texas—, 84 S. W. Rep. 661.

Persons who enter into contractual relations through an agent do so at their peril. They are bound to ascertain both the fact that agency exists and the extent of authority. Wells v. Michigan Mutual Life Ins. Co., 41 W. Va. 131, 23 S. E. Rep. 527; Davidson v. Porter, 57 Ill. 300; Gilbert v. Deshon, 107 N. Y. 324, 14 N. E. Rep. 318; Rice v. The Peninsular Club, 52 Mich. 87, 17 N. W. Rep. 708; Reitz v. Martin, 12 Ind. 306, 74 Am. Dec. 215. But if the principal holds out another as his agent he will be bound to third persons by the authority as he has made it to appear. Banks v. Everest, 35 Kan. 687, 12 Pac. Rep. 141; Dysart v. K. & T. Ry. Co., 122 Fed. Rep. 228, 58 C. C. A. 592; Brown v. Eno, 48 Neb. 538, 67 N. W. Rep. 434; Aldrich v. Wilmarth, 3 S. D. 523, 54 N. W. Rep. 811; Griggs v. Selden, 58 Vt. 561, 5 Atl. Rep. 504; Dodge